

REMARKS

Claims 1-16 were rejected in the Office Action, and this rejection was made final. Claims 1, 2, 4, 6, 8, 9, 11-13 and 15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102 as being fully anticipated by U.S. Patent 6,092,114 (Shaffer, et al.), and Claims 3, 10 and 14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over Shaffer, et al. in view of a document title "Conversion Service" (CERN). Also, Claims 5 and 16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over Shaffer, et al. in view of U.S. Patent 6,549,918 (Probert, Jr. et al), and Claim 7 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over Probert, Jr. et al. in view of CERN.

Applicants herein ask that independent Claims 1, 7, 8 and 12 be amended to better define the subject matters of these claims. In addition, Claim 6 is herein being cancelled, and new Claim 17 is being added as a substitute therefor. For the reasons discussed below, Claims 1-5 and 7-17 patentably distinguish over the prior art and are allowable. The Examiner is, thus, requested to enter this Amendment, to reconsider and to withdraw the rejections of Claims 1-5 and 7-16 and to allow these claims and new Claim 17.

The present invention, generally, relates to methods and systems for allowing a computer to work with input data that is in a format nominally incompatible with the operating system of the computer. Generally, if a data file is not compatible with the computer's operating system, the file is transmitted over the Internet to a remote Universal Server, which transforms the data file into a format compatible with the computer's operating system.

Several procedures may be used to transform the data file. For example, the universal Server may be provided with a module having a set, or library, of source codes, and the Universal Server may obtain from this module the source code for the data file, and use this source code to transform the data file.

The prior art of record does not disclose or suggest sending a data file from a computer to a remote server to transform the file so that it is compatible with the computer's operating system.

For instance, Shaffer, et al. discloses methods and systems for providing compatibility between file attachments of messages and resource capabilities of devices to which the messages are directed. The procedure includes out-taking conversion of file formats when it is determined that a client device does not include the resources to directly access an attachment without conversion. In one disclosed embodiment, the determination of whether an attachment is accessible without conversion by a target client device occurs at the server, and in another embodiment, the determination of whether an attachment is accessible without conversion occurs at the target client device.

Importantly, though, in the procedures disclosed in Shaffer, et al., as well as with the procedure discussed in CERN, the data files are converted to be compatible with applications of the target computer, not the operating system of that computer.

Probert, Jr. et al. discloses an operating system layer between software components or application programs that expect information to be in one format and a persistent store manager of the operating system which maintains the information in its persistent form. This operating system, which is of the general type discussed in the background section of the present

application, provides on the fly conversion between the file format expected by the application layer and the format used by the persistent store manager.

As discussed in the present application, this prior art arrangement has a disadvantage in that it is difficult to find all the types of filters that would be needed so that every type of file could be used.

Independent Claims 1, 7, 8 and 12 clearly describe the above-discussed difference between this invention and the prior art. Specifically, Claims 1 and 12 include the steps of transmitting the data file over the Internet from the computer to a universal server, and the universal server transforming the data file into a format compatible with the operating system of the computer. Claim 8, which is directed to a system for re-formatting computer files, includes analogous apparatus limitations. Also, Claim 7 sets forth the step of sending the data from the computer over a network to a remote Universal Driver, and reformatting the data, on that Driver, into a format compatible to the operating system of the computer.

This feature of the invention is of utility because it allows the computer users to use programs that are nominally incompatible with the computer's operating system, without requiring that the computer itself have all the filters, codes and applications needed to perform the re-formatting.

It should be noted that re-formatting a data file to be compatible with a computer's operating system is not an obvious modification or extension of reformatting the file to be compatible with other applications on the computer, as is done in Shaffer, et al. This is because the former involves complications and difficulties not incurred with the latter. Simply being able to re-format a data file to be compatible with other applications on the computer does not suggest re-formatting, or teach how to re-format, the data file to be compatible with an operating system.

The other references of record have been reviewed, and it is believed that these other references, whether considered individually or in combination, are no more pertinent than Shaffer, et al, Probert, Jr, et al, and CERN.

In light of the above-discussion, it cannot be said that any of Claims 1, 7, 8 or 12 is anticipated by or is an obvious modification of the prior art. Accordingly, these claims patentably distinguish over the prior art and are allowable. Claims 2-5 and 17 are dependent from, and are allowable with, Claim 1; and Claims 9-11 are dependent from Claim 8 and are allowable therewith. Similarly, Claims 13-16 are dependent from Claim 12 and are allowable therewith. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and to withdraw the rejection of Claims 1, 2, 4, 8, 9, 11-13 and 15 under 35 U.S.C. §102 and the rejections of Claims 3, 5, 10, 14 and 16 under 35 U.S.C. §103, and to allow these claims and new Claim 17.

The changes to Claims 1, 7, 8 and 12 are being requested only to better define the subject matters of these claims. Also, new Claim 17 is being added as a substitute for previous claim 5. Thus, the addition of Claim 17 does not increase the number of pending claims. It is, hence, believed that entry of this Amendment is appropriate, and such entry is respectfully requested.

For the reasons advanced above, the Examiner is asked to enter this Amendment, to reconsider and to withdraw the rejections of Claims 1-5 and 7-16, and to allow Claims 1-5 and 7-17. If the Examiner believes that a telephone conference with Applicants' Attorneys would be advantageous to the disposition of this case, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

John S. Sensny
John S. Sensny
Registration No. 28,757
Attorney for Applicants

Scully, Scott, Murphy & Presser
400 Garden City Plaza
Garden City, New York 11530
(516) 742-4343

JSS:jy